

☐ SECRET

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP78B04770A001600010082-5

CONFIDENTIAL

997093

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

CONTRACT INSPECTION REPORT

CONTRACT NO.

TASK NO.

TO:

ENGINEERING SECTION/CB/PD/OL

DATE

13 September 1965

INSPECTION REPORT NO. (If final, so state)

10

ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE

1 March 1966

NAME OF CONTRACTOR

Declass Review by NGA.

TYPE OF COMMODITY OR SERVICE

One Contact Duplicating and Reseau Printer
One High Resolution Step and Repeat Printer

THE CONTRACTOR IS ON SCHEDULE

☐ YES

☒ NO

THE CONTRACTOR WILL PROBABLY REMAIN WITHIN ALLOCATED FUNDS ☐ YES ☒ NO IF ANSWER IS "NO" ADVISE RECOMMENDATION AND/OR ACTION OF SPONSORING OFFICE, ON REVERSE HEREOF. IF KNOWN, INDICATE MAGNITUDE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS INVOLVED.

PER CENT OF WORK COMPLETED - See Item 3 on reverse

PER CENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED - reverse

See Item 2 on reverse

HAS AN INTERIM REPORT, FINAL REPORT, PROTOTYPE, OR OTHER END ITEM BEEN RECEIVED FROM THE CONTRACTOR DURING THE PERIOD? ☒ YES ☐ NO (If yes, give details on reverse side.)

HAS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY BEEN DELIVERED TO CONTRACTOR DURING THIS PERIOD? ☐ YES ☒ NO (If yes, indicate items, quantity, and cost on reverse side.)

INCENTIVES

IS THIS AN INCENTIVE CONTRACT
IF YES, CHECK TYPE

☒ YES

☐ NO

☐ COST

☒ PERFORMANCE

☐ DELIVERY

NOTE:

USE REVERSE SIDE FOR COMMENTS.

FINAL REPORT MUST CONTAIN INCENTIVE EVALUATION.

OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR

1. ☐ OUTSTANDING

3. ☐ ABOVE AVERAGE

5. ☒ BELOW AVERAGE 7. ☐ UNSATISFACTORY

2. ☐ EXCELLENT

4. ☐ AVERAGE

6. ☐ BARELY ADEQUATE

IF OVERALL PERFORMANCE OF CONTRACTOR IS UNSATISFACTORY OR BARELY ADEQUATE, INDICATE REASONS ON REVERSE SIDE.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

☒ CONTINUE AS PROGRAMMED

☐ WITHHOLD PAYMENT PENDING
SATISFACTORY PERFORMANCE

☐ TERMINATE

☐ OTHER (Specify)

IF TERMINATION IS RECOMMENDED OR IF THIS IS A FINAL REPORT PUT COMMENTS ON REVERSE IN NARRATIVE FORM ON CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE AND CERTIFY THAT ALL DELIVERABLE ITEMS UNDER THE CONTRACT HAVE BEEN RECEIVED. THESE INCLUDE, WHERE APPLICABLE, THE FOLLOWING:

ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY	ITEM	REC'D	DOES NOT APPLY
PROTOTYPES			MANUALS		
DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS			FINAL REPORT		
PRODUCTION AND/OR OTHER END ITEMS			SPECIAL TOOLING		
			OTHER GOVERNMENT PROPERTY		

DATE OF LAST CONTACT WITH CONTRACTOR:

9 September 1965

SIGNATURE OF INS

INSPECTOR'S EXTE

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP78B04770A001600010082-5

☐ SECRET☒ CONFIDENTIAL☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP78B04770A001600010082-5

NARRATIVE REPORT

☒ INTERIM☐ FINAL

1. The following monthly reports have been received:
- No. 11, for the period 1 May to 1 June 1965
 - No. 12, for the period 1 June to 1 July 1965
 - No. 13, for the period 1 July to 1 September 1965
2. On 2 September 1965, [] gave the Technical Representative informal copies of their letter of 31 August 1965, informing us of an expected increase in cost due to a change in scope. The magnitude of the cost increase is [] for Printer No. 1 and [] for Printer No. 2, a total of [] including an increase in fee. This letter is being evaluated by the Development Branch, P&DS/NPIC. A decision will not be made until we have also evaluated the audit being made on this contract.
3. Monthly report number 13 presented cost expenditures, as of 31 July 1965, as follows:

Printer No. 1 (87% of time used)
Printer No. 2 (65% of time used)

Total

From the information contained in the 31 August letter, it is now obvious that the contractor was not reporting commitments and therefore was not providing sufficient information to properly report the percentage of funds expended or its relationship to the percent of work completed.

4. Printer No. 1:
- [] GDRADA, and [] DESPA-AMS, are not fully satisfied with the Test Plan which [] wrote for this printer. They feel that it still lacks sufficient detail, but rather than delay the project, will accept it. They intend to be quite strict when they evaluate the performance of the printer during the acceptance tests.
 - Delivery of this printer will be delayed because of, among other things, problems encountered in sensing frame edges on positive film. It appears that [] was not sufficiently aware of the magnitude of this problem as early in the program as they should have been.
 - With the exception of the above, work on this printer appears to be progressing satisfactorily.
5. Printer No. 2:
- Two kinds of "banding" or unevenness of exposure of the raw stock, have been encountered. One type was due to dark streaks in the fluorescent tube which provides the illumination for exposing the raw stock. This has been eliminated by the use of fixed magnets, whose field affect the ionized gas in the desired manner. The other type of "banding" was due to variations in the velocity of the exposure lamp transport.
 - [] expects to use DC motors as their speed can be held to within $\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the desired spec. Use of DC motors will also permit as much as a 10:1 range in the velocity of the transport, which in turn will permit increasing the exposure time if desired.
 - This printer will also be delayed due to the same problems encountered in sensing frame edges as with Printer No. 1. Several approaches will be tried but it appears that the contractor has reached the limits imposed by the electronic components available on the market.

☐ UNCLASSIFIED

Approved For Release 2005/05/20 : CIA-RDP78B04770A001600010082-5

☒ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET